



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (concluded)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Nogueira (Portugal)</i>	<i>525</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)</i>	<i>532</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of India</i>	<i>536</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Guinea</i>	<i>536</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Indonesia</i>	<i>537</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Somalia</i>	<i>538</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Ethiopia</i>	<i>541</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Cameroon</i>	<i>542</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Cyprus</i>	<i>543</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Tanganyika</i>	<i>543</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Senegal</i>	<i>544</i>
<i>Organization of work</i>	<i>545</i>

**President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN
(Pakistan).**

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (concluded)*

Mr. NOGUEIRA (Portugal): It gives me great pleasure, Mr. President, to join all those who have congratulated you on your election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. The choice of your name is a well-deserved tribute to your high personal qualities and to the outstanding contributions you have made to the work of the highest international organizations. Also, it is a fitting tribute to your great country, with which, I am happy to say, my country has cordial relations of warm friendship.

We have before us the report of the Acting Secretary-General on the work of the United Nations during the past year [A/5201]. It is an important document, and I believe we should be grateful to the Secretary-General for drawing up such a clear and comprehensive summary, thus enabling us to have a vivid picture of the activities of the Organization. In the introduction to the report [A/5201/Add.1], the Secretary-General draws our attention to some points the importance of which cannot and should not be underestimated. I shall refer to some of them.

The Secretary-General points out the lack of progress with regard to the problem of disarmament. Now, as Chairman Khrushchev has stated in this all—and rightly stated, for once—the question of disarmament is the question of questions, and one has to admit that in respect of a problem so vital for the future of mankind the United Nations has failed to help in finding any solution. We have to go even further, and state that the United Nations has been utterly in-

capable of dealing with the question of disarmament at all.

4. The Secretary-General also points out that, notwithstanding the efforts of the United Nations, the Organization again has failed to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, as required by the Charter. Indeed, the Secretary-General states that it has become abundantly clear that the rate of development has fallen far short of meeting the needs and demands of the peoples.

5. Again, the report mentions the part which the United Nations should play in promoting closer contact among Governments and in shaping decisions of individual Members, and the Secretary-General stresses that all too frequently this purpose has been defeated in the general debate. It should therefore not be a matter for surprise if the Secretary-General speaks of a "crisis of confidence" in the United Nations. My delegation believes that there is a very real and serious crisis, which becomes deeper every day, and, if the trend now prevailing goes on much longer it seems hard to see how such a crisis can be surmounted.

6. But there are other very serious problems in the world, threatening the peace and security of all of us, with which the United Nations does not appear to be concerned. I am not going to elaborate on them, except to mention the existing threat against the freedom of West Berlin, in violation of international agreements and responsibilities. There is no doubt, therefore, that the Secretary-General has very good reasons to refer to a "crisis of confidence". It is true that he believes that such a crisis may be overcome. On this point my delegation also wishes to express its views, but I shall come to that later.

7. There is only one further point in this context which I venture to mention. The introduction to the report expresses the feeling that the General Assembly should indeed be a world parliament of mankind. It will be extremely dangerous if such an idea becomes one more slogan in the minds of the people. There is not, and there cannot be, any analogy or connexion between a national parliament and the General Assembly. Before we start using this slogan it seems appropriate to know whether the General Assembly represents a united sovereignty, as national parliaments do; and whether the Members of the General Assembly periodically stand for election, as happens with national parliaments; or whether Members of the Assembly may not be returned and may be replaced by others, according to their performance and the views of an electorate which in the case of the United Nations simply does not exist. These few questions show that the General Assembly has no sovereignty of its own, and also show how unrealistic it is—and how dangerous it may become—to be guided by meaningless slogans and to shape our thoughts and decisions accordingly.

* Resumed from 1153rd meeting.

8. I have gone through the report of the Secretary-General, and my delegation wishes to bring up some of the many questions dealt with in that document. The first is the "question of Goa", and I am raising it not only because it is of interest to us but also because it raises issues—very important issues—of a general character which I believe the Assembly should consider with attention if we are not to pursue a course of action which will bring about the destruction of the United Nations.

9. Ever since the Indian Union became an independent and sovereign State in 1947, its Government has claimed Goa, the reason for such a claim being that Goa is geographically contiguous to Indian territory. In a note addressed to the Security Council on 13 December 1961,^{1/} the Indian Government stated once again that, since India had achieved independence, it "naturally" hoped that other foreign territories in the Indian sub-continent would be transferred to India. Naturally, indeed! We are not aware that the Indian Union, by becoming independent from the United Kingdom, has thus acquired at the same time a natural and inherent right to incorporate in its territory other territories which did not depend on British sovereignty at that time or at any time. Should it be otherwise, then all the countries which have achieved independence from the United Kingdom would also be entitled to incorporate neighbouring territories or countries, even though they have never been under British sovereignty. And then the Indian Union, if it possesses that "natural" and inherent right, may also claim neighbouring countries which have been under British sovereignty, only more so than in regard to those which were never a British responsibility. On the other hand, we are not aware that this God-given right of India may only be applied in respect of Portuguese territories, unless such an application constitutes only the first step of the Indian Union along the path of the application of the same right of annexation to other independent countries which exist at present in the Indian sub-continent.

10. Then the Indian Government has officially stated that, being in favour of the independence of peoples, it would like to start negotiations for the transfer of power from Portugal to India. The conclusions to be drawn from such a statement are that annexation of a territory by India immediately gives to that territory the status of independence—while the integration of the same territory into another sovereignty gives it the status of a "colony"; secondly, that Indian sovereignty has to be considered better than and superior to any other sovereignty; and finally that the negotiations desired by India were not to be conducted between the people of the territory and the responsible country, as required by the resolutions of the General Assembly, but between the responsible country and India, and this merely for the purpose of transferring the territory to India. In regard to this last point, one has to note therefore that, when the Indian Government seeks to annex an alleged colonial territory, it demands that such negotiations ought only to consist in the transfer of the territory from the sovereignty to which it belongs to the sovereignty of the Indian Union. Since Indian sovereignty, in our humble view, is neither superior nor inferior to Portuguese sovereignty, we fail to understand how and why, in the case of Portuguese India, the territory would become any more

independent than it was by the fact of its abandoning Portuguese sovereignty in order to be incorporated into Indian sovereignty.

11. Then, seeing the fallacy of all these arguments, the Indian Government appealed to other types of action. For fourteen or fifteen years, the Indian Government terrorized the population of Goa. Everything was tried—economic blockade, terrorism across the border, slanderous propaganda—and, being a liberal-minded Government, the Indian Government closed down Portuguese associations in Bombay, suppressed Portuguese newspapers, and dismissed and persecuted the many thousands of Goans who, although being in Indian territory, did not wish to lose their Portuguese nationality. At the same time the Indian Government appealed to political arguments, and these were, in substance, that Goa was a threat to the security of India. Indeed, 700,000 people were a threat to a nation of 450 million inhabitants. And still, in spite of all this, the Goans failed to be impressed—and Goa was peaceful, normal, enjoying an ever-increasing prosperity, and always displaying its desire to belong to the Portuguese nation.

12. Why was that so? What was the situation in Goa before Indian aggression? Goa had 4,500 civil servants, and, with the exception of ten technicians, they were Goans from the highest to the lowest rank. The police were all Goans. The municipal and legislative bodies were entirely composed of Goans, elected through direct, universal and secret suffrage; and the Goans since 1822 had been represented by their elected deputies in the National Assembly. The wealth of Goa remained in Goa, and the standard of life, in every respect, was between four and five times higher than in the Indian Union. There was religious freedom, no race segregation, no caste system. Goa was truly self-governed and self-administered, all its inhabitants exercising full political and public rights on a footing of absolute equality of opportunities and guarantees. But let us suppose for a second that the situation was different. Let us suppose that the situation was not satisfactory and in harmony with the United Nations Charter. Then the fact might have imposed upon us certain duties; but it would not have given the Indian Union any rights, unless the Government of India attributes to itself special duties to supervise international society and, single-handed, assumes prerogatives over the administration of other countries. The fact—the indisputable fact—remains that the Goans did not show any wish whatever to abandon the Portuguese nation, and it became intolerable to the Indian Government that the Goans did not display the slightest desire to be merged with India, which is a country entirely alien to them.

13. Faced with hostility from the whole Goan population, either in Goa or abroad, faced with the clear-cut decision of the International Court of Justice of 12 April 1960,^{2/} recognizing the legitimacy of Portuguese sovereignty, the Indian Union resorted to force and committed a barbarous and brutal aggression.

14. I am not going to elaborate on facts which are well known, but my delegation believes that some points are worth stressing. After the Prime Minister of India had stated: "The Portuguese would not be tolerated in Goa, even if the Goans want them there", it became increasingly clear that the Indian Government had de-

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1961, document S/5020.

^{2/} Case concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory (merits), Judgement of 12 April 1960; I.C.J. Reports 1960, p. 6.

aided to resort to sheer force. And then various and ridiculous pretexts to create friction and establish an emotional climate became a matter of routine. When India asserted that Goa was a threat to its security, we offered to negotiate an international guarantee which would ensure the neutralization of Goa. The Indian Government refused. When India claimed that there were border incidents, we offered to negotiate an arrangement providing for the strict control of the border. The Indian Government refused. When India indicated that it might wish some railway and harbour facilities in Goa, we offered to negotiate in order to grant the requested facilities. The Indian Government refused, and every proposal, every negotiation was refused. The Prime Minister of India, respectful as he says he is of the wishes of the people, even stated that he would not accept a plebiscite—probably because the Indian Government knew that the results would be overwhelmingly against it, and also because it did not wish a plebiscite elsewhere in the Indian sub-continent. And, finally, the Prime Minister of India stated that his patience was exhausted and that there was no other solution but to annex Goa by military force.

15. That was the Prime Minister's great argument: his patience was exhausted. We are not aware of the validity of such an argument. But that was the prelude to the brutal invasion, and as a preliminary step accusations were thrown against Portugal to the effect that we not only were violating but also trying to conquer Indian territory. That we were trying to conquer Indian territory indeed. I do not believe that human imagination has ever provided a better display of simulation and falsehood.

16. We then proposed that an international commission of observers should be appointed forthwith to investigate the alleged violations of the Indian border by the Portuguese authorities. The Indian Government replied that the proposal was unacceptable because there was no border. And so, after having ignored the decision of the International Court, after having disregarded a last-minute appeal by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and after having disregarded a majority vote of the Security Council, the Indian military forces, on 18 December 1961, attacked and later occupied Goa. Those forces were composed of more than 50,000 Indian troops, many Indian Air Force squadrons and the Indian navy. They were described by the Indian Government as "defensive forces". Their purpose was said to be to "liberate" Goa, to protect it, and to avoid the "massacre" of the small Portuguese forces by the Goans.

17. Aggression is always aggression, but it is far more revolting when it is coupled with distortion and barefaced falsehoods. This feeling was well expressed by the Indian poet Don Morais: writing in the London Evening Standard, on 21 December 1961, he said: "I am an Indian, and on this day I cannot but feel ashamed." And he gave up Indian nationality.

18. What is the situation in Goa at the present moment, after the so-called "liberation"? A foreign priest who has escaped from Goa writes in the Mombasa Times of 28 April 1962: "Indian rule has not meant liberation but complete slavery." And he goes on: "The Goan people cannot even walk freely on the streets or attend the churches for fear of being robbed or assaulted by Indians."

19. And in an editorial the Indian Express of 16 March 1962 writes that crimes such as murder, rape,

molestation and looting cannot be condoned in Goa, and then adds:

"And the fact that in the inflated imagination of the local population our liberation forces, instead of ensuring security, should signify insecurity is deeply disquieting and even dangerous."

I could mention many more quotations, but these are enough to convey a vivid picture of Goa at present, under the colonial rule of India.

20. I shall just add a few details for the information of the Assembly. Unemployment is rising all the time in Goa. People have been deprived of their property and goods for the benefit of the invaders. Trade has been brought to a standstill: the importation of 146 types of goods has been prohibited, as one can see in the Indian Board of Trade Journal of 29 June 1962. Religious persecution has been introduced, and social and racial segregation has become wide-spread. The administration is now all Indian, and the police force is also all Indian, and all Goans are excluded. Wages and salaries have been lowered between four and five times, so as to bring them level with Indian standards, and accordingly the standard of living in Goa also has been lowered between four and five times. There is unrest among labour, and the miners have asked that Portuguese legislation should be put back into force again. The wealth of the mines, which has always remained in Goan hands, now goes to India, and the iron ore is feeding Indian industries.

21. Goa is being militarized. It is interesting to quote from the Goan Tribune of 29 April 1962: "It is understood that the Indian Navy is proposing to locate its aircraft base in Goa. Under this scheme, Dabolim airport will be operated by the Indian Navy."

22. Those who wish to keep Portuguese nationality are being persecuted and arrested, and Indian nationality is being forced on the people under duress. India had engaged itself in writing not to do this, and so in this respect once again the Indian Union is breaking all written engagements. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Goan people are fleeing their land of birth to avoid misery and suffering. Since December last, more than 3,000 Goans have fled to Lisbon, and as many to other parts of the world. In view of the foregoing, it seems appropriate to recall what the Prime Minister of India said before Parliament on 26 August 1954:

"The freedom and rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution of India and which specifically refer to freedom of conscience, worship and practice of religion, will extend in full measure and in all their implications to these areas (of Goa). The special circumstances of cultural, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial group which history has created will be respected."

Back in 1954, therefore, the Prime Minister of India recognized the special personality and individuality of Goa, which has no connexion with India. We now see how these promises are being fulfilled. The shock of dismay of the Goan population grows deeper every day, and we should not be surprised by the fact that the Goan Association of Nairobi, which represents tens of thousands of Goans and which is certainly free from any Portuguese influence, addressed a letter to the Prime Minister of India on 26 February 1962, asking for the withdrawal of Indian occupation forces and of Indian administration and demanding self-determination for Goa. The Indian Commission in Nairobi re-

plied to this letter, on behalf of its Government, on 20 March 1962. I quote a passage from the Indian reply:

"The Government of India fail to understand your reference to a plebiscite in the context of self-determination. Democracy does not envisage that parts of an integral nation should resort to any such process. Goa, Daman and Diu are not different countries despite their past occupation by a foreign Power."

23. So the Assembly can see that in 1954 Goa was considered by India as a special territorial group created by history; in 1962 there is no difference between Goa and the rest of India. Such is the painful plight of the people of Goa, and I will leave it to the Assembly to judge whether Goa has been "liberated" or is now, as is the case, under the oppression of foreign military rule.

24. But I said that the question of Goa raised in the report of the Secretary-General on which I am commenting, has a deeper meaning of a general character. I do not wish to tax the patience of the Assembly. I shall confine myself, therefore, to two observations.

Mr. Diallo Telli (Guinea), Vice-President, took the Chair.

25. Speaking before the Security Council in December 1961,^{3/} the Indian representative stated that "Charter or no Charter, Council or no Council", law or no law, the Government of India was going ahead with the military invasion because "colonialism" was a permanent aggression against which one is entitled to react. This attitude of the Indian representative has never been denied or corrected by the Indian Government. This gives rise to far-reaching issues. In accordance with United Nations resolutions, in favour of which India has voted, Goa was a Non-Self-Governing Territory, and for such territories to achieve autonomy or independence the Charter and the resolutions of the Assembly envisage that certain principles be observed. But violent annexation by the Indian Union is certainly not one of those principles. Since the Indian Union has resorted to violent annexation, we wonder if the Indian Union proposes to annex only alleged Non-Self-Governing Territories which are contiguous to it, or even other territories which are geographically separated. This question seems to be pertinent because no reason can be seen why the Indian Union will not apply to any Non-Self-Governing Territory the same principle, that is, violent annexation by India as a means of granting independence to a territory—which India has considered lawful in respect of Portuguese territories. But the remark made by the Indian representative before the Security Council to the effect that "colonialism" is a permanent aggression is far more grave. This new doctrine points to the aggressor: the country which is responsible for the territory held to be non-self-governing. But it does not say who is the victim of such an aggression. As there are no objective rules of law in force to define who is being victimized by the aggression, one has to come to the conclusion that the victim is the country which claims to be the victim. But in order to put down an aggression one has to have the appropriate means, that is, one has to be strong. Therefore, the victim of a "colonial aggression" is the country which simply claims that quality and which is militarily strong enough to put down the

aggression. In other words, the country which is able to wage war against the weak is the victim, and as it claims to be facing an aggression such a war becomes a just war and the country waging it is acting in self-defence. The question of colonialism, and the means to end it, becomes therefore a problem of transferring a territory from the sovereignty of a weak country to the sovereignty of a powerful country. This is where the new doctrine put forward by the Indian Union leads us.

26. But the violent annexation of Goa by India requires a second observation, which is the following. The grab of Goa is just the first step in the drive of the Indian Government to secure political unity in the sub-continent of India. These have been other previous steps: Junagadh in 1947, Hyderabad in 1948. Then we have to recall the policy of extermination against the Naga people, who are claiming self-determination. We also know the problem of Kashmir, which is referred to in the annual report of the Secretary-General under the heading "The India-Pakistan question". The Indian aggression against Kashmir, a territory which rightfully belongs to Pakistan, is a further step of the drive I am referring to. And this should be a warning to all the small and weak neighbours of the Indian Union. They are next in line. And here I am not expressing a personal view or a personal feeling. I shall quote from the Ceylonese paper Daily News of 19 December 1961: "And countries like ours, neighbours of the vast Indian sub-continent, will inevitably feel a stirring of disquiet since her powerful and swiftly developing neighbour has chosen to use arms to end an argument". From another Ceylonese paper, the Ceylon Observer of 18 December 1961 I quote:

"The use of force by India is particularly disturbing for smaller nations who are neighbours of India. It creates a fear among India's neighbours who are far weaker than she is that similar military action may be used against them when the patience of India's leaders is exhausted that such problems as those affecting Indian minorities have not been settled."

However, Indian dreams do not stop on the sub-continent. Years ago, the Prime Minister of India made the following statement, which seems to me pertinent to recall: "When we have achieved our sovereign rights, it is our intention to make East Africa part of the Indian Empire." And one must say that the Indian Government has not been slow in carrying out its intention to make East Africa part of the Indian Empire.

27. In this context, a few suggestions appear to be relevant. Why was the Indian Government so eager in supplying the largest contingent of troops to the United Nations forces operating in Africa? Why are the Indian officers and soldiers buying farms, plantations and other land property in that part of the territory where they are stationed? Why are the demobilized Indian officers and soldiers not returning to India? Let us not forget that there are already nearly one million Indians in East Africa and elsewhere on the African continent. And I submit that the African countries and population should in time see these warning signs, which are merely a foretaste of Indian colonization and exploitation of the African peoples. These are facts which have to be brought out so as to place in the proper setting Indian friendship for Africa and its all too keen interest in African affairs, and also to provide us with a better understanding of the reasons why India claims the leadership of the African-Asian bloc in this Organization and elsewhere.

^{3/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, 987th meeting.

28. I am sure that the Indian delegation is going to deny all these facts and will once again come to this rostrum and play its usual part—that of a mediator between God and all of us, who are just poor mortals, and of providing us with some immaculate and selfless advice on other countries' problems.

29. I now turn to other chapters of the Secretary-General's report. I wish to refer to what the report calls "the situation in Angola" and "questions" concerning Portuguese overseas territories. These problems, like others, will be dealt with elsewhere at the appropriate time. However, in the course of this general debate some delegations have mentioned them and, therefore, it seems to me that it is fitting that my delegation should also deal with them.

30. We all know that the problems to which I refer have been allocated to three different Committees. On the appointment of those Committees by the Assembly, and on their illegality, my delegation has already expressed its views and strong reservations and I am not going to repeat them now. But those Committees have been very active during the past year and it appears useful to examine, although very briefly, the work that they have done. Again, my delegation will have more to say when the whole question comes up for debate in the appropriate Committee. At this stage, I merely wish to make one or two remarks.

31. As the Assembly may recall, there is first the Sub-Committee of five members.^{4/} It has not yet presented its report, and so we do not know what its findings will be. But if we are to draw some conclusions from its previous report [A/4978 and Corr.2], we shall have no doubts concerning its lack of objectivity, its partiality, its intention merely to please a majority and not to set out the facts and realities as they are. My Government extended to the Sub-Committee its full co-operation and provided it with the fullest possible information in every field. That was factual and official information, on which the Portuguese State relies in taking its decisions on administration and policy. But the Sub-Committee ignored and discarded all such data and information and chose to rely only on anonymous information secured through hearsay. No responsible Government can accept that.

32. And then we have the Special Committee of seventeen members.^{5/} It has just provided us with its full report [A/5238]. My delegation has not yet studied it, but we have followed its proceedings and we all know the recommendations which it has already adopted. What has been stated in the Special Committee and the draft resolutions which it has adopted do not bear, at least in so far as we are concerned, the remotest connexion with reality. It is enough to recall the draft resolution on Mozambique. There is peace, there is normalcy, there is constant development in every field—and still the draft resolution speaks of repression by military means and of a threat to international peace and security. It is outrageous and it is revolting, and it is also an affront to the United Nations itself.

33. Incidentally, it occurs to me to make one remark. The delegation of India voted in favour of that draft resolution and therefore subscribed to the view that there is oppression in Mozambique, and racial segre-

gation, and what not. But still, the Indian Government raised every possible opposition when the Portuguese Government decided that the many thousands of Indian nationals residing in Mozambique had to leave that province and depart for India or elsewhere. Does the Indian Government wish thousands of its nationals to be subjected to oppression and racial segregation? If not, then it should gladly have agreed to their departure. The explanation is that the Indian Government wants its nationals to stay on in Mozambique, as elsewhere in Africa, as the advance fifth column to carry out Indian intentions to make East Africa and other parts of Africa parts of the Indian empire. Again I am not using my imagination; the Indian Press has stated that if Indian nationals in Mozambique have to leave the Province, then the Indian Government should see to it that they are kept together in India, as a unit, so that one day they may go back to Mozambique and settle in the territory, colonize it, and exploit it. One may read this, for instance, in editorials in the Times of India. How dubious, how false, therefore, was India's stand when, in the Special Committee of seventeen members it voted for the draft resolution on Mozambique.

34. And then we have the Special Committee of seven members.^{6/} The Special Committee has already presented its report [A/5160] and we shall deal with it in detail at another stage. Now I merely wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to the methods and procedures of that Committee, and to the frame of mind and intentions of the majority of its members. Against the Charter, against the rules of procedure, against the practice of the Assembly, the Special Committee decided to hear "petitioners" from Portuguese overseas territories. How was that done? I could, and later I shall, provide full evidence on this point, but at the moment I wish merely to read to the Assembly an article from the newspaper Sunday News of 6 May 1962, published in Dar es Salaam. It reads:

"The Committee (of seven members) plans to remain in Dar es Salaam until 20 May, and anybody wishing to appear before it with written statements or to give oral evidence should contact Mr. G. M. Rutabanzibwa of the Prime Minister's Office (External Affairs and Defence)".

35. Anybody could come forward and make statements, and it did not matter who or of what nationality. And the whole business, the whole show was organized, arranged, and directed, by the office of the highest authority of a foreign Government. The Charter authorizes the Assembly to hear petitioners who have requested to be heard, and then only in regard to Trust Territories, but here we have petitioners by invitation, petitioners by incitement, petitioners by advertisement, and this creates a very interesting precedent of far-reaching consequences which from now on we may explore in regard to those countries, big and small, which have hundreds of thousands of exiles outside their territories. Indeed, I am sure that those "petitioners", as it were, have provided the Special Committee with what it considers as impartial and reliable evidence.

36. But I turn now to another example of the Special Committee's methods. In its report one may read the following:

"In the course of the examination of the labour situation in the Territories under Portuguese ad-

^{4/} Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola.

^{5/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

^{6/} Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration.

ministration the Committee had always in mind the report of the ILO Commission which had already studied in detail all the legislation relating to the labour conditions in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea." [A/5160, para. 347.]

And again in its report the Special Committee writes:

"The information provided by the petitioners gives further substance to the findings of the ILO Commission concerning the existence of forced labour in the Territories..." [ibid. para. 367].

37. We have seen that the petitioners may be anybody, but the point to be made from this quotation is different and far more serious. The Special Committee of seven members states that there was an ILO Commission which had already studied in detail all the legislation in relation to labour conditions in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. But what the Special Committee does not say is that, apart from studying the legislation, the Commission went to Angola and to Mozambique and made a lengthy and detailed investigation of all labour and social conditions in the territories; that the ILO Commission, whose members were Switzerland, Senegal and Uruguay, has drawn up a long report;²¹ and that, in its report, the ILO Commission not only completely exonerated Portugal from any practices of forced labour, but also stated that it had found in both territories some of the most advanced social and labour realizations on the Continent of Africa.

38. Notwithstanding all this, the Special Committee dares to state in its report [A/5160] that the findings of the ILO Commission were to the effect that there is forced labour—precisely the opposite of the conclusions of the ILO Commission. The Sub-Committee of five members has ignored and distorted all official and factual information supplied by my Government. Now the Special Committee of seven members distorts and denies the findings of such an honourable and prestigious organization as the ILO, which, it is convenient to recall, is one of the most important specialized agencies of the United Nations.

39. Indeed, how can a serious and self-respecting Government co-operate with committees whose methods of work are based on partiality, bias, distortion, and who try to conceal the most obvious realities? No matter how disposed we might have been to co-operate with these Committees, they themselves have made it impossible for us to do so. And, also, if the various organs of the United Nations family start to deny and contradict each other, I wonder where we are going to be led, and how world public opinion can place any trust in them.

40. In the course of the general debate, references have been made to Angola and to Mozambique, and criticism has been addressed to Portuguese policy. I have studied the speeches made here, and I must say that I have found that no reasons whatever have been given for the criticism addressed to us. Portuguese policy is criticized for the sake of criticism; but no one shows or explains why such criticism is made, nor does anyone appear to be interested in assessing the merits of Portuguese policy and of its ideological foundation. It seems useful, therefore, to outline a few

basic points for the benefit of those who are of good faith.

41. We firmly believe that no race in the world is inherently superior or inferior to any other race and, therefore, we are strongly opposed to any kind of racial supremacy or racial segregation. We also firmly believe that all races should live together and work together harmoniously for the common welfare. Again, it is our long-standing opinion that all races and all peoples can make useful contributions for the benefit of mankind, and that progress can be achieved only if such contributions are pooled together. Therefore, an integrated, multiracial society, drawing on the cultural and moral values of all races and peoples, is a basic feature of Portuguese policy.

42. When I speak of a multiracial society, I do not have in mind the mere coexistence of different racial or ethnic groups; I have in mind a society where all ethnic groups are closely integrated and knitted together with a deep feeling of oneness. We feel that history substantiates this view. Nations formed by more than one race have been and are great nations, and in those countries which close themselves to any contacts we see that no progress is made and that they become dormant and stagnant communities. Then, and this is another basic feature of Portuguese policy, we believe that the healthy growth of a human society is better secured if all are equal before the law and if the same opportunities for advancement in all fields are granted and are open to all, irrespective of race, colour, religion or social origin. This means the same rights and duties for all. Here we come to the most important point in Portuguese policy, and that is that the same political rights should be provided for all, the same educational opportunities, the same economic and social possibilities. These fields embrace the whole life of any given human society, and its progress should be measured in terms of the full participation of the whole population in the political, educational, economic and social activities of the territory concerned.

Mr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

43. Accordingly, the furtherance and expansion of such participation are, in so far as we are concerned, the guide-lines of Portuguese policy in all overseas Territories. Along these lines and for that purpose, and in accordance with our centuries-old tradition of non-discrimination in the defence of human rights, many reforms and measures have been made and implemented, both in the political field and in the economic field, in the educational and the administrative fields, so that further steps forward may be taken. In this connexion, it may interest the Assembly to know that in Lisbon a special session of the Overseas Council started last Monday, with the participation of all the members of the legislative councils elected by the various provinces; and of all the deputies also locally elected, and the purpose of this gathering is to debate a revision of the Overseas Organic Law. We do not claim perfection. But the reality is that, within the Portuguese nation, and in keeping with the provisions of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, all are equal, with the same political and civil rights, enjoying the same political representation, having access to the same opportunities for education and social advancement, and all this both in law and in practice. We do not claim perfection—but we certainly do claim far more perfection than most of our critics.

²¹ International Labour Office, Report of the Commission appointed under Article 26 of the Constitution of the International Labour Organization to Examine the Complaint Filed by the Government of Ghana concerning the Observance by the Government of Portugal of the Abolition of forced Labour Convention 1957 (No. 105), Geneva, 1962.

44. Now, I do not wish to tire the Assembly, but I think it necessary to place before it a few relevant facts. Some speak of Angola and of Mozambique and of other territories as though they were the virgin jungle and it becomes important, therefore, to see what the actual situation is.

45. Let us see the question of education. In January 1962, there were in Mozambique 8,664 educational establishments, including primary schools, industrial, technical and training schools and high schools. The student population was of the order of 940,000 students. As for Angola, there were on the same date 17,630 educational institutions with a total student population of 710,000 pupils. For these two Territories alone, therefore, we have a total student population of 1,650,000. To this we have to add nearly 3,000 students of Angola and Mozambique who are studying at university level. We are aware of the need for more educational facilities, and plans to expand them are ready, and we hope soon to be able to carry them out. But on this question of education we have just taken a very important step forward, and that is the establishment of universities at Luanda, capital city of Angola, and at Lourenço Marques, capital city of Mozambique. Still speaking on education, it may interest the Assembly to know the following detail: the proportion of enrolled students to the population in Angola and Mozambique is about 17 per cent, whereas in the rest of Africa the average proportion is only 10 per cent. In accordance with a 1961 UNESCO publication, in the whole continent of Africa, only Nigeria, with its large population, has more primary schools than Angola or Mozambique. I hope my distinguished colleagues from Nigeria do not mind my referring to their country in this context. But all these educational facilities are being expanded; only this year, in Angola and in Mozambique together, 138 new primary schools have been established, twenty-three new high and technical schools have also been created, and 600 new teachers have been recruited.

46. Let us see now some more figures on health and welfare services. In Angola and Mozambique there are five large general hospitals, ninety-five regional hospitals, 167 health offices, 429 health posts, 336 health posts for the control of leprosy, 200 maternity hospitals, and some other establishments for the control and treatment of specific diseases.

47. But the expansion of education and health and welfare services has gone hand in hand with the economic and industrial development. The construction of hydroelectric dams for the supply of power, the establishment of many new industries, the development of agriculture—all this has proceeded and is proceeding at a fast pace. In this connexion, I think it right to point out that both in Angola and Mozambique we find some of the best equipped harbours in Africa; we find one of the highest percentages of civil construction on that continent; and we also find that the percentage of production of electric power per inhabitant is higher than that of most territories in Africa. Finally, the rate of economic growth in Angola, during 1961, has been one of the highest on the whole continent.

48. Therefore, an immense capacity for distortion and misrepresentation is required to present the facts as they sometimes are presented in this Organization. In point of fact, Angola and Mozambique are two of the most advanced Territories in Africa, in every field, and they can stand favourable com-

parison with the Territories of those who are our strongest critics. When hearing this, some may think that my delegation has biased views. But then I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the evidence and testimony provided by all the foreigners who have visited Angola and Mozambique. In this context, the Assembly may be interested in knowing that both Territories, open as they are to anyone with an impartial and objective mind, have been visited, and indeed surveyed, by a total of more than 300 foreign correspondents from newspapers from all over the world during the last year—300 newspapermen, and among them there were representatives of the most important and respected organs of the international Press and news agencies. I only wish the Assembly would be interested in reading their reports. And I wish also to stress the fact that the ILO has conducted a survey of the Territories, as I have indicated, that the World Health Organization has finished its own survey, and that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations will very shortly do the same. How can anyone say that those Territories are not freely open?

49. I now revert to a point which I referred to at the beginning of my statement, that is, the "crisis of confidence" in the United Nations. We do believe that there is in fact a real crisis, and we could find many reasons for it. In our view, however, the most important reason stems from the fact that the Charter is not being respected and implemented. Some say that the charter should be a living document, always adapting itself to changing times. My delegation does not dispute this view, and it may well be that a revision of the Charter is called for. If that should prove to be the case, then we should avail ourselves of the provisions set out in the Charter for its revision and amendment. What we cannot agree with is that amendments should be made by a simple majority vote, the result being that our basic law changes from day to day in accordance with particular whims or interests. This does not make the Charter a living document: any law is a living law only to the extent to which it is respected and applied and, therefore, in full force.

50. When we ignore the law, or when we amend it through unconstitutional procedures, then we are actually killing it; and I am afraid that this is precisely what is happening to the Charter. When we see that countries are allowed to resort to naked aggression to end arguments, thereby violating Articles 1, 2 and 33 of the Charter; when countries are allowed to establish in their territories military bases to launch attacks against the borders of neighbouring territories, thereby ignoring the letter and the spirit of the very Preamble of the Charter; when Chapters XI and XII of the Charter are brushed aside and interpreted in a way which bears no connexion with their letter and spirit; when Chapter XVIII is entirely forgotten and the Charter is revised by a simple majority vote, then we are in reality killing our basic law. In this context, and referring to some procedures which have recently been adopted, I am bound to say that my Government does not understand the deep concern shown by some in respect of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice stating that Members should contribute to the United Nations forces in the Congo, when this Assembly, this very Assembly, did not show the least concern for the implementation of a decision of the Court—not a mere advisory opinion, but a clear-cut judgement—which was favourable to my country in respect of Goa.

51. For all the foregoing reasons, we think that it is urgent to go back to the true principles and philosophy of the Charter. Some say that we should strive for world peace through world law. My delegation agrees entirely. But to achieve that, first and foremost we must have a law and we must respect and apply it—and we must do so without a double standard. My delegation believes that the United Nations cannot indulge in an "ivory tower" policy, taking decisions by slogans which have only served to raise clouds of confusion. We cannot buy world peace with world chaos. It is to be feared that such a policy may not succeed, and mankind may be led into a world war by an Organization meant to defend world peace.

52. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation I wish to congratulate you on your election to this high office and fully to associate my delegation with the warm appreciation of your rare qualities and accomplishments so widely expressed in this Assembly. We are happy that our deliberations here will be under your wise guidance.

53. I also wish to express our appreciation of the successful conduct of the proceedings of the last session by the President, Mr. Mongi Slim, and for his constructive suggestions for expediting the work of the General Assembly.

54. My delegation will not in this debate take time to re-state its position on problems on which its stand has already been made clear on previous occasions. Our President, Archbishop Makarios, in his statement to the General Assembly on 7 June 1962 [1107th meeting], fully defined the attitude of Cyprus, and re-affirmed its consistent and steadfast policy of non-alignment. My delegation will, therefore, confine its remarks mainly to the United Nations itself and to certain matters connected with the over-all problem of war and peace.

55. A useful aspect of the general debate in reviewing the international situation is to assess the progress and development of the United Nations, to take stock of its achievements and its shortcomings in an effort to see how the latter could be remedied and the former extended. This aspect acquires particular significance now because of a growing awareness of the urgent need for a stronger and more effective United Nations to meet the threatening challenges of our time.

56. My delegation attaches paramount importance to the United Nations, for we believe the course of all major problems largely depends upon this Organization and its development not only as a forum of world opinion, but also as an effective instrument of international security and peace.

57. I will not weary the Assembly, particularly at this late stage of the debate, with any elaborate stock-taking. However, looking at last year's session, we find that in a quiet way no little has been achieved by the United Nations in maintaining peace and in promoting freedom. Its own crisis over, the office of the Secretary-General found a happy solution in arrangements preserving the independence and international character of that office, as provided in the Charter, through the unanimous election of U Thant as Acting Secretary-General.

58. Through the United Nations, strife-torn Rwanda emerged to peaceful independence, while Burundi peacefully attained its sovereign statehood.

59. An agreed solution in Algeria, putting an end to seven years of war and bloodshed by recognizing the self-determination and independence of the heroic Algerian people, was broadly based on last year's resolution of the General Assembly.

60. A growing crisis in the Congo, heading for partition of the territory and threatening international peace, was effectively kept in check by the positive action of the United Nations. We fully appreciate the constructive and resolute part played by the Acting Secretary-General in the Congo. We endorse his reconciliation plan preserving the integrity of the territory, and we support his proposal for economic sanctions.

61. On the problem of West Irian, the United Nations, through the mediation of the Acting Secretary-General, proved highly effective in achieving agreement between the Netherlands and Indonesia on a just solution under the aegis of the United Nations and with its actual participation. It is significant that the exercise of temporary executive authority was undertaken by the United Nations and was established by and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary-General. This is an important step towards developing the United Nations executive action.

62. Perhaps a most significant feat of that session was the spirit of agreement that prevailed between the United States and the Soviet Union in a unanimous resolution on the exploration of outer space. This agreement was in keeping with the subject itself. An enlightened co-operation started in this field could well be a factor towards creating a sorely needed climate of confidence between the two sides in the treatment of other vital subjects.

63. Among other constructive achievements of that session, one of no little importance has been the concerted attack on poverty, disease and illiteracy through the launching of the United Nations Development Decade. Another is the agreement on the principles of disarmament and on the negotiating forum; also the unanimous resolution on the question of Bolzano, leading to friendly and hopeful negotiations between Italy and Austria for a final solution. And there were others as well.

64. This is by no means a poor record of achievement for a single session of the General Assembly. And there is more. The adoption of measures for the implementation of the Declaration on colonialism, by the setting up of the Special Committee of seventeen members and other special committees, has been an energetic and decisive move for the speedy liquidation of colonialism.

65. My delegation pledges itself to support all measures for the early attainment of that objective through the fullest application everywhere of self-determination under the Charter.

66. We salute and cordially welcome all the new States that have emerged to independence and have joined the United Nations at this session. Their presence here will be a great contribution to the United Nations in its arduous tasks ahead. The increasing numbers of new Member States, all dedicated to a strong United Nations, are both a proof of the fruitful work of the Organization and a promise for its direly needed development. With the emergence to independence of a growing number of new States, colonialism is fast disappearing. Yet its effects in

creating divisions and imbalances in the world are a hindrance to peaceful progress.

67. It is a particularly sad and melancholy fact that there are areas—Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa and others—where classical colonialism still persists in a vain effort to arrest the course of history. But it will not be for long. The wind of freedom is now sweeping over Africa and the world. All peoples will soon take their rightful place under the sun in full equality and freedom in a balanced international community. Timely recognition of present-day realities and of the need of co-operating with the inevitable would be in the best interests of the dominant Powers. By granting freedom they will no less liberate themselves from outdated concepts that weigh heavily upon their progressiveness of outlook, as well as upon their international stature and moral influence. Delivered from the burdens of colonialism, they would bring a fuller contribution to world progress.

68. In the field of decolonization, the United Nations during the last two years has gone a long way towards accomplishing one of its objectives: that of promoting equality and universal freedom. It has also been dynamically carrying out a global effort in the field of social and economic progress. The vital question, however, remains how far the United Nations has succeeded in its main purpose under the Charter—that of establishing world peace. It cannot be denied that United Nations intervention has overcome many international crises and prevented war. The instances are well known. It has thus, albeit in a stop-gap way, effectively maintained peace. If the United Nations were not in existence war and chaos would have been with us long ago.

69. However, in spite of its impressive record of achievement, the United Nations has made no progress towards averting the dangers of war or towards establishing world peace. While technological advance has revolutionized the concept of war and of international relations, the United Nations has been unable to move on and meet the challenges of our nuclear age.

70. One of the factors adversely affecting such necessary evolution has been colonialism in its effort to resist self-determination and change. Its influence is now rapidly waning. The other factor, and the real stumbling block, is the cold war. It has stalled all co-operative efforts within the United Nations and outside it.

71. To overcome the influence of the cold war we need a strong United Nations; but to strengthen the United Nations we need to overcome the cold war influence, its mistrusts and suspicions. The United Nations, however, will have to break through this vicious circle, for the world situation is one fraught with immeasurable dangers. Not only are we today under the imminent threat of war, but worse still, of a war infinitely more destructive in its effects than the drafters of the Charter could ever have conceived. A war which would not mean merely "untold sorrow", but the possible extinction of all life on this planet.

72. Competitive production of nuclear weapons on an unprecedented scale, in preparation for war, goes on relentlessly while the destructive potential of such weapons has reached fantastic levels. We do not doubt the genuine desire and determination of the leaders of the nuclear Powers to avoid war. However, the catastrophe from a nuclear conflagration may come

at any moment, from any cause, sparked off by the uncontrollable momentum of a spiralling arms race. The inability of the nuclear-Power leaders to stop the arms race in spite of general recognition of its imminent dangers and its futility, speaks eloquently of helplessness in the present entangled and complicated world situation.

73. Efforts at disarmament agreement hold out little hope of success. Repeated and long negotiations over many years have led nowhere. A gleam of hope from the new negotiations at Geneva is now fading away. Although the conference opened its proceedings under new and more favourable conditions, with the constructive participation of eight non-aligned nations and with the principles of disarmament agreed upon, yet it has made no headway. After six months of labour negotiations, no agreement has been reached on even one point out of the many that have been the subject of negotiation. Yet disarmament and peace is realizable. But it can hardly be attained in a climate of cold war and mistrust, nor can it be expected to result from negotiations on various plans of disarmament depending on theories of balanced forces on which the respective attitudes are basically irreconcilable.

74. To achieve agreement on disarmament, co-operation should first be sought towards establishing international order and security. Disarmament in a world of anarchy is utopian. A modicum of world order and international security is a primary necessity. The time has come in human evolution for the adjustment of outdated concepts to the present-day realities of a nuclear age.

75. National security through armaments, in the sense of effectively protecting the homeland, is increasingly becoming unrealistic. It is rendered meaningless from its very inability to prevent a total destruction of that homeland and of its people in a matter of minutes by nuclear missiles launched perhaps from the other side of the globe. The deterrent effect of power to retaliate is only a temporary expedient, while the arms race resulting from it steadily leads to mutual suicide and general eclipse. The concept of force as an instrument of policy is continually losing its significance and will have to be abandoned. Correspondingly, moral considerations in the pursuit of practical policies acquire increasing importance. Effective national security today can only come from international co-operation in common security. It is the essential pre-condition to disarmament. The road to international security can only be attained through strengthening the United Nations morally and materially and increasing its executive authority and power so that it can effectively establish a world of law and order.

76. We believe that all the smaller countries should pool their efforts and their collective moral force in breaking through the crisis of confidence among the great Powers and in strengthening the United Nations. We realize well enough that the way to an orderly world is neither short nor easy. It is a long steep climb through rocky trails and perilous passes, but it is the only positive way. Efforts in negative directions are wasted steps in the desert towards the mirage of an ever-vanishing reach. Any development of the United Nations has come from the force of circumstances and events, not from planned effort.

77. It is true that the United States disarmament plan provides at the end of its first stage for the

consideration of measures strengthening the capability of the United Nations to maintain international security and peace. Such steps, however, are made dependent on the inclusion of the whole disarmament agreement, instead of preceding it. In our view, measures for strengthening the United Nations should be taken independently—independently, that is, of disarmament agreements and without delay, in order to create conditions facilitating disarmament. In this field of positive action, co-operation between the leading world Powers could, and should, be fruitful. It is encouraging that a large measure of agreement on a strong and effective United Nations emanated from the statements in this debate by non-aligned and small countries, as well as by the great Powers.

78. This session must be the session of decisive action. Co-operation in strengthening the rule of law is an important aspect of the development of the United Nations as an instrument of world order and peace.

79. Consideration would have to be given to the authority and effectiveness of the judicial arm of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice. Compliance with its decisions and rulings is a question involving respect for the rule of law within the Organization itself. The matter could perhaps be seen in this light by Member States who refuse to pay their apportioned contribution. They might, therefore, re-examine their position and assume their responsibilities under the advisory opinion given by the International Court of Justice. In this way the totality of the United Nations as an Organization for order and peace would be reinforced. The international character of the members of the International Court and their primary allegiance to the United Nations should be such as to ensure their universality of spirit commanding global respect. Organizational aspects for increasing the authority of the Court might eventually be the subject of a conference specially convened, for it is of paramount importance that the rule of law is encouraged and strengthened by respect everywhere.

80. Another question for urgent consideration is the improvement of the financial capability of the United Nations so that it can meet the increasing responsibilities that come with its growing activities in a developing world. In our view, the suggestions made in this respect by the Foreign Minister of Ireland [1142nd meeting] merit careful consideration.

81. We confidently hope that the difficulties that have arisen with regard to the non-payment of contributions will be overcome because at a time when the development of the United Nations is of foremost importance, it would be sadly ironical if its finances were to be in danger of a crisis because of the failure of its members to contribute. But we further feel that the United Nations should not depend entirely on Government contributions. It should acquire its own resources and means of existence. There are many ways of achieving this purpose and there have been a number of proposals; some of them would be such that the peoples of the world would contribute directly to the United Nations which would be a practical realization of the ideal reflected in the opening words of the Charter.

82. Within the context of developing the executive authority of the United Nations falls the question of enforcement power. Although the United Nations derives its strength from the dedication and allegiance of the peoples of the world, it should also acquire the means of effectively supporting and enforcing its

decisions. Measures will have to be taken for the establishment and systematic development of a United Nations peace force, recruited by and for the United Nations, which would form the basis of an international security force. The primary allegiance of such a United Nations force would be directly to the United Nations, rendering this force truly international in the service of mankind.

83. In this connexion, in reference to the spirit of allegiance that should lead the international civil servants in their actions, the late Dag Hammarskjöld developed the thesis that a civil servant, although owing allegiance to his own opinions or ideals, can, regardless of them, as a man of integrity "readily act in an exclusively international spirit in the service of the Organization". This is certainly the conduct that would be expected and even demanded from the international civil servant. But we would go a step further. We feel that in this world of rapid progress the need of developing a United Nations conscience is already with us. There should be a deeper dedication to the United Nations from which the actions of the international civil servant will be guided. Through that development there would be allegiance to the United Nations not from a mere sense of duty but as the outcome of a belief in the ideal of the United Nations and dedication to its purposes. The spirit of the international civil servant will then find its fuller and more effective realization in the harmony, and not the mere compromise, between his ideals and his duties. We believe the time has come when the broader concepts of paramount allegiance to humanity will become a reality.

84. The awakening consciousness among men and women the world over of the common destiny of men in the face of the threat from nuclear extinction, and of the common concern in survival could lead to a spirit of world-mindedness and a United Nations allegiance.

85. A matter that will have to be dealt with at this session in the way of developing the United Nations is the increase in membership of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council in order to accord with the expanded membership of the United Nations itself in a more equitable geographic distribution. An amendment of the Charter would in this case be required, on which we hope there will be agreement between the permanent members of the Security Council.

86. As we all know, in order to develop the United Nations, a revision of the Charter may be necessary. But there are many areas in which the United Nations can substantially evolve and acquire increased power through General Assembly action.

87. As the supreme organ of the United Nations, the General Assembly has authority under the Charter to concern itself with international security and peace. It has in the past exercised such authority and has been able effectively to meet situations endangering world peace. The setting up and dispatch of United Nations emergency forces to disturbed areas is an instance.

88. Within the framework of the aims of the United Nations, as determined in the Preamble to the Charter, and within its purposes and principles, as defined in the Articles of the Charter, the General Assembly can through practical application increase the executive power of the United Nations. Thus, cumbersome procedures and perhaps insuperable difficulties involved

in amending the Charter may in certain cases be overcome.

89. In the introduction to Kelsen's treatise on the law of the United Nations, it is pointedly stated:

"...the law of a community—national or international—and especially its constitution or constitutional treaty, may be changed not only by formal amendments carried out in accordance with the procedure laid down for this purpose in the law itself. It may be modified also by its actual application based on an interpretation which, more or less consistent with the letter of the law, is not in conformity with the ascertainable intention of its authors. This is the way the law adapts itself to changing circumstances if it is too difficult or impossible to put in operation the amendment procedure".^{8/}

Similar views were expressed in 1947 by Judge Alvarez in an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in reference to Article 4 of the United Nations Charter.^{9/}

90. The full development of the United Nations, however, is not a mere matter of decision and procedure. It is closely bound to the moral evolution of mankind. It will depend on the ability of the United Nations to conform with the higher and unprecedented standards of international morality now demanded from nations and peoples by the progress of science and the threat of nuclear extinction. The future of humanity depends on whether it will be able to achieve these standards. However, the growing awareness of the compelling need for world order through the United Nations is a stimulating sign.

91. Before closing, I should like to speak on nuclear testing. Of all the items before the Assembly, the one that will have to be dealt with decisively at this session is the question of the continued nuclear test race. As we are all aware, it constitutes the gravest threat to human life, not only because it perfects and extends the destructive power of nuclear weapons in preparation for war, but also because it causes immeasurable harm to human life and health through increasing radiation levels. According to the predictions of specialists, hundreds of thousands of persons will suffer agonizing death from leukaemia and other forms of cancer as a result of bomb tests that have already been carried out in the atmosphere. Thus, there is the certainty that thousands of deaths will occur from those tests, not to mention the ones that are yet to be carried out. The genetic damage is even worse, involving not only the present but also future generations of mankind.

92. This problem is profoundly disturbing to all people everywhere, it is therefore deplorable that the long negotiations for a test ban have remained inconclusive. Yet agreement on such a ban, unlike an agreement on general and complete disarmament, now appears to be easy to achieve. The proposals contained in the memorandum of 16 April 1962, submitted by the eight non-aligned nations at the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva,^{10/} could well form the basis of agreement—

particularly since the differences between the two sides have been greatly reduced, and they now are, or should be, very close to agreement in respect of a ban on tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space; with regard to those three areas the United States and the United Kingdom no longer insist upon international inspection and control, a requirement that had so long been the stumbling block. Furthermore, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, stated here [1127th meeting] that his country would agree to such a separate treaty on certain conditions relating to the suspension of underground tests pending the conclusion of a final treaty.

93. Despite the fact that the two sides are so near, we are witnessing at this very moment a highly accelerated nuclear test race. During the last few days there have been test-explosions by both sides. This acceleration in the test race is in contradiction to the stated intentions of the nuclear Powers that there should be a ban on tests. It seems directly to contradict the idea of negotiations in Geneva leading to an agreement. This is discouraging to the peoples of the world. It seems as though the nuclear Powers have not yet actually decided to renounce the arms race and that this is the reason for the present deadlock.

94. Thus, as the representative of India at the Geneva Conference said recently in the First Committee, the situation now is mainly a political one. It would therefore appear that agreement on a ban is beyond the level of the Geneva Conference. Political decisions at the level of the leaders of the nuclear Powers would appear to be required in order to solve this problem conclusively. A special summit meeting to decide upon a test ban would appear to be not only desirable but necessary if agreement is to be reached on this grave problem, the solution of which admits of no further delay. Premier Khrushchev's prospective visit here during the coming two months, which has been rumoured, would be an excellent occasion for such a summit meeting, which could be fruitful in arriving at a nuclear test ban. Success in this field would be an important factor in creating a better atmosphere and facilitating agreement on other international problems. As I have said, there are no differences between the two sides in respect of a ban on tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. Hence, agreement should be reached and a treaty signed in respect of those three environments.

95. At the same time, there might be an arrangement for the interim establishment of an international commission of scientists entrusted with the task of verification of doubtful seismic events by all possible means, including on-site inspections, with the co-operation and subject to the permission of the party on whose territory the seismic event had occurred. The commission would be entitled to use national identification or detection stations for its work and to require the co-operation of the party on whose territory a suspected seismic event had occurred. The party concerned might be required to grant permission for on-site inspection for the purpose of verification. Such permission would not be withheld unreasonably. It would, further, be provided in the interim arrangement that if, as a result of the refusal by the party concerned to permit inspection, two or more suspected seismic events remained unidentified, such a refusal would be considered as a factor in substantiating the view that the events had been occasioned by test explosions.

^{8/} Hans Kelsen, *Recent Trends in the Law of the United Nations* (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1951), p. 911.

^{9/} *Admissior of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Order of December 12th, 1947: I.C.J. Reports 1947, p. 67.*

^{10/} *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1 January 1961 to December 1962, document DC/203, annex I, section J.*

96. In such a situation, the other parties would be free to suspend or call for a review of the interim arrangements on underground tests. Agreement on such or similar lines might prove workable. It would be an interim arrangement. The experience to be gained in the practical application of this arrangement might be instructive in relation to the actual necessity, or otherwise, of having on-site inspections for the purpose of verification of seismic events. And it could also be enlightening as to the possibilities of consent by the party concerned to on-site inspection in concrete instances, as distinct from a priori general consent to allow inspection anywhere. Such experience could prove helpful in facilitating the conclusion of a treaty on underground tests. In addition, they might further afford to both sides an occasion to establish their good faith in a way that would dissipate at least some of the exaggerated fears and suspicions that have so long bedevilled all efforts at a disarmament agreement.

97. We put forward these suggestions in all humility and in the hope that they may be of some little assistance in promoting a ban on all nuclear tests, a matter which is of the gravest concern to all nations and peoples, including, we believe, the peoples of the nuclear Powers themselves.

98. My delegation earnestly hopes that an agreement to end all tests will be reached between the nuclear Powers during this session of the General Assembly. A report thereon will have to be submitted to the Assembly within such time as would make it possible for the Assembly, in case of failure, to consider and adopt further urgent measures before the end of the year.

99. This session, having opened in the very thick of a nuclear test race, bears a heavy responsibility not to remain inactive in face of this dangerous situation and a growing menace to the very conditions of life on this globe. If no agreement on a test ban is reached, the General Assembly has a compelling duty to exert all its influence and its moral authority in order to arrest the further continuance of the evil of tests.

100. Consideration will therefore have to be given by the General Assembly to appropriate measures, including the adoption of a resolution condemning tests as a crime against humanity and outlawing them as from a date to be fixed.

101. Radio-active contamination of the earth's environment through nuclear testing is a violation of mankind's fundamental right to life. It is aggression against mankind as a whole. As such it violates the Charter and is contrary to international law. This is a new and unprecedented kind of war that is now being waged not between the nuclear Powers but by both of them jointly against humanity. It is for humanity to defend itself by raising its vigorous voice within and outside the United Nations and giving full expression to its will for survival and life.

102. The attention of the world in these critical moments is anxiously focused on the Assembly. On its decisions and actions the life of the present and future generations of mankind may largely depend.

103. The PRESIDENT: This brings to a close the list of speakers in the general debate. However, I have received several requests to exercise the right of reply. Some relate to a speech made this afternoon, and some relate to speeches made earlier. I think the best course would be first to call upon those delegations

which have asked to exercise the right of reply in respect of the speech made this afternoon. If there is no objection to that procedure, I shall presently call on the representative of India.

104. In addition to the requests to exercise the right of reply in respect of this afternoon's speech I have three requests—from the delegations of Pakistan, Somalia and Indonesia—to exercise the right of reply to previous speeches. With regard to Pakistan's request, I have received word that, owing to the very late stage reached in the general debate and to the time already taken up by replies and counter-replies, the Pakistan delegation will not ask for the rostrum to exercise its right of reply but will circulate the reply among the Members of the General Assembly.

105. I am very anxious to close the general debate this evening, even if it should involve sitting somewhat late, but not too late. In view of the extremely fine effort that has been made by everyone to have the proceedings start on time, it would not be fair to continue the meeting very long after the accepted closing hour.

106. In view of that, I shall be very happy to call, in the order which I have indicated, on the delegations which are anxious to exercise the right of reply. I would suggest, however, that any further statements in exercise of the right of reply should be circulated to the Members of the General Assembly. At the same time I shall not bar any delegation which insists upon exercising its right of reply from the rostrum.

107. I now recognize the representative of India in exercise of the right of reply.

108. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): I shall be extremely brief. The Foreign Minister of Portugal has allowed his imagination to run riot and has drawn a picture which is so absurd that it does not deserve a reply. It is amazing that the Foreign Minister should have referred to certain newspaper articles from Ceylon when the representative of Ceylon so eloquently welcomed in the Security Council last year the termination of foreign colonial rule in a part of India. His attempt to drive a wedge between India and Africa is pathetic. Africa certainly knows what Portugal is, and it is not for me to enlighten the Africans. The complaint by Portugal that the Charter has not been respected and implemented would have been amusing had not the consequences of its own consistent violation of the Charter been so tragic.

109. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): It is in my capacity as Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on Territories under Portuguese Administration during the Committee's visit to Africa that I have considered it my duty to take the floor. I could not leave unanswered certain statements made this afternoon by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal, and I should like to correct for the record certain allegations until such time as the competent committee can go fully and thoroughly into the whole distressing matter of the fate of the Portuguese colonies.

110. The Minister for Foreign Affairs has quoted from a Dar es Salaam newspaper to substantiate his assertion that, in short, the Special Committee of Seven has been inviting anybody who wished to make statements [see paragraph 34 above]. The records of the proceedings of the Special Committee of Seven are, of course, available to refute that assertion and I shall not dwell on this point. I wish, however, to invite

the General Assembly's attention to the statement by the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs that the Special Committee is responsible for the fact that no co-operation has been forthcoming from Portugal. We should like to point out that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal simply omitted to mention all the efforts undertaken by the Special Committee, and particularly the letters addressed to the Minister himself which have never elicited a favourable reply.

111. Let it be noted in passing that, although Portugal claims that there is no racial segregation in its colonies, we are compelled to state that the economic segregation practised there engenders a type of racial segregation which is certainly the most tragic type of all. If that is Portugal's contribution to the progress of mankind, to which that country's Minister for Foreign Affairs refers, we can only repeat that after 500 years of it, it leaves Portugal's colonies lagging far behind most African States.

112. I shall conclude by saying that this afternoon we have witnessed something which, to our way of thinking, is a tragedy, for we were hoping that, bearing in mind the situation prevailing in all the former colonial territories, particularly in Africa, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal would have introduced a new element to our debate. Unfortunately, he has confined himself once again to defending assimilation, despite the fact that assimilation has been rejected once and for all by all the African peoples and that this rejection has been consummated in this very hall.

113. We have all witnessed the tribute paid here by the colonial Powers to countries which have had experience of the very process that Portugal is today vainly trying to impose on its colonies. The conflict, naturally, cannot be between the Special Committee of Seven and the Portuguese Government. It is between the latter and the peoples it is oppressing in Africa and elsewhere. To be more specific, the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs should refrain from giving such a—may I say—fanciful account of the Special Committee. The few passages he was good enough to quote to us are only truncated excerpts from a complete report [A/5160] which is available to all the Members of the General Assembly.

114. Mrs. SUPENI (Indonesia): At this late hour the Indonesian delegation certainly has no wish to prolong the general debate, which has already taken up so much of our precious and limited time. However, the statements made by some delegations on the recent Indonesia-Netherlands agreement on West Irian have made it necessary for us to exercise the right of reply. We have waited until the end of the debate so that we can reply to all those delegations together and so save as much time as possible.

115. The Indonesian delegation regrets the statements made by the representatives of Senegal, Cameroon, Niger, Madagascar, the Central African Republic, the Congo (Brazzaville) and Upper Volta. We do not, of course, object to the simple fact that delegations hold opinions that differ from our own, but it is our considered view that the opinions of those seven delegations emanate from a misunderstanding of the real issues involved in the West Irian question.

116. I do not wish to reiterate here all the facts of the case which Indonesia in the past has so often described in detail. However, for the sake of the spirit of international understanding in the Assembly,

I should like to clarify certain points in the course of my reply to individual delegations.

117. I shall now turn to specific statements made by some of those delegations. In his statement the representative of Senegal characterized the Indonesia-Netherlands agreement with the words "a country claims another country". It must come as rather a surprise to a great number of Member States to hear such a comment. It seems unfair to invite the representative of Senegal to study all the points that have been submitted by the Indonesian delegation and by many other delegations over the past eight years in order to get a clear view of the West Irian issue. I shall refer only to the speech made by the representative of Senegal, Mr. Thiam, in the course of the general debate last year. Speaking on his country's attitude with regard to the Algerian question, Mr. Thiam made this comment:

"From the very instant that a colonized territory accedes to independence its new sovereignty must be exercised within the boundaries where colonial sovereignty extended." [1012th meeting, para. 44.]

And Mr. Thiam went on to say:

"...when we speak of the integrity of the Algerian territory, this obviously implies a territory which was defined and limited by the Administering Authority" [ibid.].

From that statement alone it is abundantly clear that the West Irian agreement is in no way open to an interpretation that can be summed up in the words "a country claims another country".

118. Next, my delegation was somewhat taken aback, as were, I am sure, many others in this Assembly, to hear the representative of the Central African Republic labelling Indonesia as another colonial Power. The reply that we have just given to Senegal should suffice to answer that allegation also. Indonesia, as it has repeatedly and categorically stated, has never claimed another territory. The young history of our Republic is in itself proof that we have always fought against colonialism and imperialism in any form. Our independence has been achieved through a bitter struggle, and we shall continue to give our fullest support to all nations still engaged in the fight against colonialism.

119. Not only have we never made any territorial claims to date, but we also categorically state that we have no intention of doing so in the future. We are not, for instance, laying claim to the other part of the island of Timor, which is now under Portuguese rule, despite the fact that the people of that territory belong to the same racial stock as we do.

120. For one ex-colony to label another ex-colony as a colonial Power is an affront to all the newly emerged nations of Asia and Africa, which share the same fundamental principles and similar histories in the struggle against colonialism.

121. The representative of Upper Volta has stated [1153rd meeting] his opinion that the West Irian agreement is not valid. I would merely comment that he appears to be alone in this opinion. However, he also contends that the Papuans are not Indonesians. In this connexion, I am forced to explain once more—and I hope the Assembly will forgive this reiteration of a fact that has already been oft repeated—that the Indonesian Republic, an archipelago of more than 3,000 islands with a combined population exceeding 97 million people, necessarily comprises many different

ethnic groups. The definition of nationhood based on a single ethnic group is no longer valid and indeed has long since become obsolete. The representative of Upper Volta further went on to state that Indonesia has betrayed the principles of the Bandung Declaration. I have, I must confess, failed to comprehend the logic of his reasoning behind this statement. I doubt whether the representative of Upper Volta is really aware of the true spirit of the ten principles embodied in the Bandung Declaration, to which my country had the honour of contributing. Moreover, he may not be aware that the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955 was unanimous in its support of Indonesia's position in the West Irian issue. All the countries which participated in this historic conference have now again confirmed their opinions by their recent vote in the Assembly on the West Irian agreement [127th meeting]. One would wonder which country is really betraying the principles of the Bandung Declaration. And I am sure that the participants at Bandung have all taken a grave view of the unfounded charge levelled against Indonesia by the representative of Upper Volta. It is a charge that causes us more sorrow than anger.

122. The Indonesian Government is aware that the apprehensions which seem to preoccupy these delegations are the result of an intensive campaign undertaken by a few persons who are trying to obstruct a peaceful settlement of the West Irian problem. These persons, originating from the territory, are being sent hither and thither to appeal for support for their separatist cause. They claim to represent what they call "the people of West Irian", whereas in reality they represent only certain interests entirely alien to the people of West Irian. In the interest of objectivity, therefore, I would respectfully urge the seven delegations concerned to try and see the other side of the picture. In this respect I would like to enlighten them by quoting a few of the statements made by the Chairman of the delegation from the National Peoples Congress of West Irian, Mr. Herman Wajoi. This congress, as Mr. Wajoi pointed out, was held in West Irian in order to reunify the people of West Irian precisely because no such people's congress has ever been held in the past. It comprised representatives of all groups: those who are still pro-Dutch, those who are pro-Indonesian and those who are following a middle-of-the-road policy, according to Mr. Wajoi. The statement which I shall now read to the Assembly was therefore made by a man who, as Chairman of the Congress, represents people of all shades of opinion. In the course of Mr. Wajoi's visit to Surabaya, East Java, he said at a Press conference on 12 October: "There is no reason to fear that we are Dutch puppets. We are puppets of nobody. We are sons of West Irian, and we are one with you, the Indonesian nation." Mr. Wajoi's statement can stand as a reply to the apprehensions voiced by these delegations.

123. Mr. ISSA (Somalia): I have taken note of the Ethiopian Foreign Minister's immediate and somewhat violent reactions to my statement last Friday [1151st meeting] concerning the continued occupation by Ethiopia of Somali territory and its hostile policies towards the Somali Republic. It was not my intention to comment at length on what the Ethiopian representative asserted, for he did not reply convincingly to any of the arguments which I had outlined. However, there are some points in his reply which cannot be overlooked because they were made with a view to distorting the truth and misleading world opinion. In the early part of his reply, the Ethiopian Foreign Minister

asked us to provide him with the answers to three questions: (1) why Ethiopia should single out the young Somali Republic for the "most-unfavoured-nation" treatment; (2) whether Somalia had forgotten the fact that for over a decade Ethiopia tirelessly fought for the right of the peoples of Somalia to join the community of free and independent nations; (3) what reason or motive could possibly prompt Ethiopia to dig the grave for the Somali Republic in the birth of which Ethiopia had, he claimed, been instrumental.

124. I am surprised that the Ethiopian representative should have looked to us for a reply when the answers he is seeking can be conveniently found in the Ethiopian Government's memorandum submitted on 13 August 1946, to the Peace Conference held in Paris after the Second World War. This memorandum, which has been included in a United Nations document, contains a fantastic claim by Ethiopia to the whole of Somaliland. Permit me to read two extracts from the memorandum which, in themselves, are sufficient to answer all three points raised by the Ethiopian Foreign Minister. The first extract reads:

"With its present frontiers, Ethiopia is entirely cut off from the sea. The entire export trade of the country must pass through foreign controlled ports to reach markets in the outside world. This inequitable state of affairs imposes a heavy penalty upon Ethiopia's entire import and export trade and places this trade at the mercy of foreign governments which might subordinate the welfare of Ethiopia's trade to their own interests. This might particularly be true should these ports be under the control of Governments which have adjacent territories, the products of which are competitive with the products of Ethiopia." [A/C.1/W.8, 11/ p. 19].

The second extract from the same Ethiopian document says this:

"Ethiopia is not only the best fitted to administer the countries of Eritrea and Somaliland, the inhabitants of which are of the same stock, but she is fully prepared to assume all the responsibilities of such administration.

" . . .

"Furthermore, the economies of Ethiopia and Eritrea are so closely interdependent that the prosperity of Eritrea will depend upon the prosperity of Ethiopia which, in turn, depends upon the obtaining of access to the sea through the return of Eritrea. The same considerations apply to the relations between Ethiopia and Somaliland." [Ibid., p. 14.]

May I repeat, the two extracts which I have read are taken from an official Ethiopian memorandum the contents of which, I am sure, the Ethiopian Foreign Minister cannot dispute.

125. I should like to cite another effort by the Imperial Ethiopian Government to lodge claim for the territory of Somalia. In November 1949, the General Assembly finally decided [resolution 289 (IV)] that Somalia should become an independent State by 1960 after a ten-year period of trusteeship administration supervised by the United Nations. This decision, which ran contrary to Ethiopian expectations, evoked immediately a protest from the Emperor, who cabled to Mr. Trygve Lie, then Secretary-General of the United Nations, and re-asserted Ethiopia's baseless claim over Somalia.

^{11/} Mimeographed document dated 30 October 1948, of the third session of the General Assembly.

126. Of course, the Ethiopian memorandum to the Paris Peace Conference and the Emperor's cable to the Secretary-General of the United Nations were not the earliest manifestations of Ethiopia's avowed territorial designs on what is now the Somali Republic. As far back as 1941, when the Emperor was planning his return to Ethiopia, he arranged for leaflets to be dropped over Eritrea and Somaliland by the British Royal Air Force, containing an undertaking to the peoples of those two countries that he would return them to their so-called Ethiopian motherland.

127. These facts which I have cited are indisputable and do not lend support to Ethiopia's often expressed claims that it has always championed Somalia's cause of freedom and independence.

128. Furthermore, the situation as I have just described it demonstrates unequivocally that the Ethiopian authorities have for some considerable time nourished the ambition of securing complete control not only over Eritrea but also over Somalia. Their designs on Somali territory have become so open and active in recent months that they now constitute a source of serious concern to my country. The situation is disconcerting because Ethiopia's complete annexation of Eritrea has encouraged it to pursue with even more vigour its expansionist policies towards the Somali Republic.

129. There is no necessity for me to emphasize that my country will take all necessary measures to safeguard the integrity of its land and the interests of its people. In this respect our resistance to Ethiopian pressure will be intensified following the regrettable fate which has transformed the proud State of Eritrea into a captive province of the Addis Ababa régime. Of course, it remains a sad fact that the United Nations should be morally and materially responsible for the very unfortunate state of affairs which exists in that former Italian possession in Africa.

130. In addition to the Ethiopian attempts to annex Somalia which I have just described, the Ethiopian authorities have been waging a most virulent and relentless propaganda campaign against the unity of the Somali territories. Those of us who have studied the Somali-Ethiopian question are conversant with the hostility which was expressed by the Ethiopian Government Press and radio when it received the news in April 1960 of the British Government's decision to grant the Somaliland Protectorate its independence in June 1960. And many of us are aware of the manner in which this propaganda was intensified later when it was announced that the Protectorate and the Trust Territory of Somalia would unite under a single Somali Government in July of that year. As I mentioned in my statement to the Assembly on Friday last [1151st meeting], this pernicious Ethiopian propaganda campaign has continued unabated and has now reached a degree of unprecedented intensity.

131. The reason behind Ethiopia's opposition are easy to detect. Ethiopia is painfully aware that the union has heralded the first major step in the process of achieving the peaceful re-unification of all Somali territories under colonial bondage. The Ethiopian authorities are aware, too, that with so much Somali territory in their grasp, and with the mounting impatience of the population there for freedom and union with the Somali Republic, the only hope they have of prolonging their brutal grip over the area is by adopting harsher administrative measures and by opposing freedom movements in the other remaining Somali territories under colonial rule.

132. These are the sole reasons behind the bitter opposition which Ethiopia continues to advance against the demand of the Somali inhabitants of the Northern Province of Kenya and French Somaliland for their speedy independence and reunion with their brothers in the Somali Republic. Should the Somali people of those two countries achieve their emancipation, the Ethiopian authorities realize that the event would have so great an impact on the Somali peoples living under their domination that not even Ethiopia's massive army, with all its modern armaments and foreign military aid and advisers, would be able to keep the population under their subjection.

133. The facts which I have narrated so far do not give credit to Ethiopia's professed anti-colonial policy; neither do they reflect favourably on its concept of Pan-Africanism. Considering the abject conditions which it forcibly imposes on the peoples within its jurisdiction, and taking into account its aggressive intentions towards its immediate African neighbours, one cannot help regarding all Ethiopia's solemn pronouncements on Pan-Africanism and African unity and brotherhood as nothing but empty phrases and lip-service.

134. While I did not expect the representative of Ethiopia to make any favourable remarks about my country, it is unfortunate that he should have found it necessary to speak so contemptuously of the territory. It is a favourite tactic of colonialist Powers to use derogatory terms, such as "arid soil", in describing land or people over which they have evil designs, if only to misrepresent the facts or to serve as a cloak for their activities.

135. However, I am glad that he has called attention to this so-called arid soil at its southern flank, because it is this very geographical feature which, from time immemorial, has kept the ruling Amharas within the confines of their mountain strongholds and acted as a barrier to their infiltration into the low-lying areas inhabited exclusively by the Somalis.

136. I could not agree more with Mr. Yifru that Ethiopia is a fertile and potentially rich country. The most unfortunate feature, however, is the fact that steps have yet to be taken by his Government to develop and exploit the natural wealth for the benefit of its inhabitants.

137. I must categorically reject the charge made by the Ethiopian Minister that the Somali Government has sent fully armed commando groups into Ethiopian territory, disguised as nomads, to carry out attacks against Ethiopian frontier patrols and the property of Ethiopian subjects. The Ethiopians have invented this charge in an attempt to excuse themselves from the atrocities which they have perpetrated on innocent Somali lives. For an impartial account of Ethiopian behaviour towards Somali nomads, one needs only to refer to the records maintained by the former British Liaison Organization when it functioned in the Reserved Areas and the Haud during the period 1955-1960.

138. The pattern of oppression which characterized Ethiopian conduct towards Somali nomads then, serves today as the basis of their suppressive policies. The world has been told of the barbarous measures adopted by the Ethiopian armed forces to destroy the town and population of Aisica in August 1960. It has been informed, too, of the Ethiopians' callous and savage rape of the village of Denot a few months later, and many are aware of the ruthless murder

of a large number of the Somali population in the town of Degabur in 1961 by trigger-happy and drunken Ethiopian troops.

139. Underlying the use of these coercive measures is the policy of the Ethiopian authorities to intimidate the nomadic population and to seal off their access to the grazing areas. These measures are being implemented in a futile attempt to shelter the Somali people living under Ethiopian colonial rule from the "wind of change" blowing over the whole of the African Continent, a wind which will inevitably reach them in the course of time.

140. On examining the Ethiopian representative's statement concerning his Government's policy towards the Somali Republic, I find it difficult to reconcile two points. In one place he threatened the inhabitants with "hardships", and then in another he solemnly declared that Somalia need not fear any form of aggression from his country. It has been a cardinal point of Ethiopian propaganda over the past two years to maintain a state of tension among the Somali nomads by threatening to deprive them of their rightful access to the traditional grazing land in the Haud and the Reserved Areas. It is important that I should record here the view that any interference by the Ethiopian authorities in the seasonal migrations of the Somali nomads to and from their traditional grazing lands could well lead to the most serious and far-reaching consequences.

141. At this stage it is relevant that I should mention briefly a few words about Ethiopia's self-assumed role as champion of a liberated Africa in accordance with the principle of self-determination. This universally accepted principle, to which all new African independent States owe their existence, is now being accorded a new interpretation by the Ethiopian régime to suit its own particularly narrow interests. We have been told by Mr. Yifru that Ethiopia cannot accept the application of this principle if it should be invoked in the interests of the fragmentation of existing States, colonial or otherwise. Obviously, this qualification has been made to safeguard its very precarious position. My delegation does not contest his assertion that in a heterogeneous society there can be unity in diversity, but we do contend that such pretensions to unity have no validity if the diverse elements are not linked by general consent. Where consent has not been obtained, the position is no different from colonialism.

142. Developing this argument further, my delegation has abundant evidence to show that the Somalis in Ethiopian occupied Somali territories never consented to being ruled by the Ethiopian régime. It is only since the latter part of 1948 that the Ethiopian authorities have been able to exercise any form of effective administrative control in the area, and this has been made possible by the employment of large military units. The people are one in their opposition to subjection by the Ethiopians.

143. I call upon the Ethiopian Government to allow the Somali people inhabiting that disputed area to be given the right to decide their own future. The colonial Powers granted this right to the people of the former British and Italian Somaliland, and representations have been made to both Britain and France to accord this same right to the inhabitants of the Northern Province of Kenya and of French Somaliland. We cannot, and will not, make an exception in Ethiopia's case simply because it is an African country. I may add here that the subtle and most unconvincing argu-

ments advanced by the Ethiopian representative will not alter my country's determination in the slightest, and that it will continue to pursue its legitimate objectives with renewed energy.

144. The Ethiopian Foreign Minister has charged that the Somali Republic's insistence on the application of the principle of self-determination in the Somali territories under Ethiopian rule would lead to the recrudescence of tribalism and would be contrary to the modern concept of a "nation State". These charges have no foundation and have been made to deceive world opinion about the truth of the matter. The Somali people are not a tribe, but form a uniquely homogeneous nation consisting of over six million people. Before the advent of European and Ethiopian imperialism into their country, the Somali people shared one large region and lived as one social unit. In conformity with the wishes of the Somali people, the Somali Republic is now striving to join together what Ethiopia has thought fit to keep apart.

145. I was amazed by the Ethiopian Foreign Minister's sensational revelation that, on 7 October, hundreds of thousands—I repeat this number, hundreds of thousands—of Somali nationals marched into Ethiopia to make strong manifestations for union with that country. I have noted also the subsequent suggestion by the Ethiopian leader that Ethiopia should, perhaps, ask for self-determination within the Somali Republic. I will not comment on the remarkable report about the so-called demonstration for union with Ethiopia, except to observe that it is the most naive and untruthful piece of propaganda yet put across by the Ethiopians to mislead world opinion about conditions in the Horn of Africa.

146. What interests my delegation much more, however, is the Ethiopian suggestion that self-determination should be granted in the Somali Republic. Now I have full authority to put forward the following challenge to the Ethiopian Government: the Somali Government is full prepared for a United Nations commission to visit the Somali Republic and ascertain from the people living there whether or not they wish to join in union with Ethiopia. If they vote for union with Ethiopia my Government will accede to the wishes of the majority of the Somali people. I attach only one condition to this proposal, that the Ethiopian Government should, in turn, permit the same independent United Nations commission to visit all the Somali territories under Ethiopian control and allow the commission to hold a plebiscite among the population there to ascertain whether or not they wish to join the Somali Republic. Should the local population vote in favour of unity with the Somali Republic, then Ethiopia must be prepared forthwith to relinquish those territories and allow them to re-unite with their motherland.

147. I am really earnest about this proposition, and I am assuming that the Ethiopian Foreign Minister is too, having broached the subject in his speech and obviously conscious of all the possible implications which it involves. I should be interested to hear his Government's reply on this very point. In putting forward this proposal, my delegation is simply underlining the stand which the Somali Republic has consistently taken, and which asks that the Somali peoples living under alien governments should be accorded the right of self-determination.

148. In his attempt to defend Ethiopia's untenable position as an African imperialist Power, I was amused by the Ethiopian representative's absurd statement

that the Somali peoples' desire for freedom and re-unification bore resemblance to the racialist, expansionist and militarist policies of the Hitlerite régime. While the contention does not deserve serious comment, it may well enlighten opinion on this matter if the following facts are taken into consideration: first, unlike the present régime in Ethiopia, the Somali Republic has never entertained, and will not entertain, the notion of dominating other nations; secondly, our demand for the immediate freedom of the Somali people and their territories from the shackles of colonial rule is by no means expansionism, but the expression of a legitimate right which has already been endorsed in principle by the Member States of this great Assembly in 1960; thirdly, in pursuance of Somalia's determination to work for the emancipation of the Somali peoples from colonial rule, the Somali Government has never departed from the obligations imposed by its Constitution which stipulates that only peaceful and legal means shall be used for the attainment of this purpose.

149. At this point it is pertinent that I should say something about the provisional boundary line. There is ample documentation available in the records of this Organization to support my delegation's contention that Ethiopian tactics during Somalia's ten-year period of trusteeship were directed solely towards the frustration of all efforts to reach a just settlement of the border problem before Somalia achieved its independence.

150. This unsolved problem presents a potential source of friction between the two neighbouring African States, and is being used as a means by Ethiopia to maintain tension throughout the region. As I explained in my previous statement, throughout Somalia's ten-year trusteeship period the matter appeared annually on the agenda of the General Assembly. For this reason it is necessary for me to reiterate that the Somali Government reserves the right to raise this matter again in the General Assembly as and when the occasion becomes opportune.

151. One other matter which the Ethiopian Foreign Minister commented upon, and which I should like to touch here, concerns Mr. Abdurahman Hussein Mahmoud, our Somali diplomat in Addis Ababa. As I have already informed this Assembly, the Ethiopian authorities deprived him of his diplomatic immunity and refused permission for his family to leave Ethiopia. These acts are in direct contravention of all accepted international practices. The Ethiopian delegation has informed this Assembly that the diplomat in question is an Ethiopian subject, and has suggested that so long as the Somali Government cannot contest that fact, the matter should be dropped.

152. I fail to understand why the Ethiopian representative should have omitted to disclose to the Assembly the fact that the Somali Government has protested strongly to his Government on the matter, and that it has already sent an official communication contesting the Ethiopian charges. I wish to repeat here that Mr. Abdurahman Hussein Mahmoud is a Somali national who has served as an accredited member of the Somali diplomatic mission in Addis Ababa for one and a half years. He entered Ethiopia with the full consent of the Ethiopian Government; he has served there for six months as the Somali Chargé d'Affaires, and he has been personally received there as an accredited Somali diplomat by Emperor Haile Selassie when the Somali Ambassador formally introduced his diplo-

matic staff to the Imperial Ethiopian Court. In the light of this information, it is to be hoped that the decision taken by the Ethiopian authorities will be reconsidered.

153. Unfortunately, the affair is assuming serious proportions because it is being used by the Ethiopian authorities as an excuse for other excesses intended to hinder the normal functions of the Somali Embassy in Addis Ababa. My Government is still waiting to hear the reasons for the arbitrary arrest and maltreatment of one of the Embassy's uniformed staff, the searching of Embassy vehicles at gun point, the maintenance of a state of siege around the Embassy premises, and the insulting behaviour of the Ethiopian police towards our Somali diplomatic representatives.

154. Ethiopia's image at home is certainly different from that which it is trying to portray on the international scene with all its double talk of friendship, goodwill and co-operation with all.

155. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Ethiopia, who wishes to exercise the right to reply.

156. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): The Foreign Minister of the Somali Republic has made it a custom to come to the rostrum to insult my people, my Government, and, indeed, at the rate he is going, I am afraid very little will be left that he will not be against.

157. As the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia stated in detail, the charges have no foundation whatsoever. They are only wild assertions and, as such, are misrepresentations. They are entirely false and fraudulent. My delegation is therefore confident that the Assembly will take them as such.

158. I shall only refer to a few of the charges. I wish to reserve my right to reply, if necessary, to all the lies, fabrications, misrepresentations and all the illogical fanning of sentiment and emotion, which was to no purpose at all. I shall refer to some of these points in order to demonstrate to the Assembly that the statements do not have one iota of truth on which they can stand. Often the wish is the father of the thought, and when that happens one can readily see where it will end.

159. The Somali Foreign Minister complained about the language that was used. He accused my Foreign Minister of being very harsh. But let us remember who used such terms as "dastardly" in referring to a State. This is enough to say in reply to the Foreign Minister of Somalia and to show that we cannot be accused of using unbecoming language. It is indeed repugnant to the very spirit of our civilization.

160. The second point that he tried to make—he rambled on in such a fashion that it was difficult to understand exactly what his objectives were—but at any rate, the second point that he tried to make was that we are an expansionist people. Therefore he went back to 1946, to 1941, to show that we are a colonial power. This is indeed remarkable. My good friend from Somalia completely ignored the fact that for 3,000 years we were one with Somalia. Somalia was part of Ethiopia; this cannot be challenged. And what is more, as the world knows, it was from that part of the country that we were attacked, and therefore, when the time came, in the 1940's, we said, "We wish to be one with you".

161. Now, where is the aggression? Where is the expansion? This has been done by every Member here who has been in a similar position, and if I may say so, this afternoon a very lucid statement was made in

support of that. But when they became independent, we said, "All right". There is no inconsistency in our position. To wish to be one does not invite condemnation.

162. Then, of course, the Foreign Minister talked of Eritrea. As I said earlier, at the rate they are going they are going to accuse everybody and everything in sight. I happen to be from Eritrea. It is my homeland. But if I am not Ethiopian, nobody else is. The answer is quite simple: we are Ethiopians. If you wish to make a division in your minds, that is up to you. Time and again in history we have fought for and maintained our integrity and our unity, and we are very proud of it.

163. The Foreign Minister went on to talk about internal matters in a reckless way. He talked about suppression, and all the rest of it. Well, if I were to use language in "tit-for-tat" fashion, I am sure he would be most unhappy.

164. It is not my people who wish to be joined to Somalia; it is they who want to join us. I am not going to be childish and indulge in a fight with statements, but only this morning it was very clearly stated in The New York Times that people in the northern part of Somalia wish to join Ethiopia. We are not going to achieve anything by trading accusations, but I will quote to the Foreign Minister the precise words. This is from The New York Times, of today, 18th October:

"Chiefs representing five tribes of the northern region, which formerly was British Somaliland, have petitioned Emperor Haile Selassie asking his help in liberating them from the 'oppression and degradation under the colonial yoke of Somali Republic rule'."

I did not fabricate this; this is in the paper. So one had better be sure of one's home before one goes about accusing others left and right.

165. Next the Foreign Minister spoke of murder, and all that. There is no such thing. It is just his own creation. And speaking about self-determination, he said, that this should be applicable to Ethiopia. Well, it is surprising, but we settled that a long time ago, and we are not going to apply self-determination every five days or every month of our lives. We accomplished that a long time ago. The people of my country, a long time ago and by fighting wars in defence of their land, have done that, and they are not going to be asked again and again, every day. So no statements along that line are going to accomplish anything.

166. But the remarkable part of it all is that the Foreign Minister of Somalia takes the floor and accuses my country of aggression, of murder, of everything, and then from this very platform says that he wants my home. Now, who has expansionist policies? The logic is so glaringly and obviously false that I am not going to dwell any longer on it.

167. Another point that he brought up was that the Secretary was a Somali national. The Secretary was not a Somali national. He was born of Ethiopian parents, he lived in Ethiopia; his brother is being educated in Ethiopia at the Menelik School, at Government expense. He did not change nationality, nor did he inform the Ethiopian Government that he was in the service of somebody else. No, he was continuously an Ethiopian national, and since he was an Ethiopian national he was subject to the Ethiopian nationality laws. There are no two ways about it; no State here would give up its laws of nationality, and we are not going to give them up either.

168. I know the time is late and I cannot deal with every point that the Foreign Minister concocted here. I have taken up much of the Assembly's time but I shall not take up any more. I am not going to lower myself to the level to which they are trying to drag me. I would rather adhere to the proper language and principles of conduct and simply state that what he has said has no foundation whatsoever.

169. We will not give up our home, not one inch of it. So was our history in the past and so it shall be, and no threats, no double-talk, no contradiction is going to make us give up our home.

170. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): As the custom is in Cameroon, where women are held in high esteem, men are advised to let them speak without contradicting them. I would have willingly followed my country's tradition and left unanswered the explanation given here a few moments ago by the gracious representative of Indonesia were it not for the extreme seriousness of the subject which affects the fate of thousands of men and women whom, with all due respect to our Indonesian colleague, anthropology today still assigns to my race, a fact which imposes a historical responsibility on us.

171. Unfortunately these people now find themselves in a situation which, in our view, does not fully safeguard their freedom of expression and freedom of self-determination.

172. Besides, the Indonesian representative merely mentioned my country and did not refer to any of the points in the statement made here by our Minister for Foreign Affairs [1140th meeting]. I am thus driven to the conclusion that the Indonesian delegation agrees with what our Minister said from this rostrum and merely regrets that our opinion was unfavourable to it.

173. It would be child's play to refute the arguments advanced this afternoon on the basis of earlier decisions, adopted by this very Assembly in connexion with similar problems, concerning non-self-governing countries acceding to sovereignty. But why do it? It is not my intention to give anyone an uneasy conscience.

174. There is one argument, however, which seems to us to be begging the question, namely that an African or Asian country cannot be tempted to have expansionist designs on neighbouring countries. This, unfortunately, is too good to be true. So far as we are concerned, our sense of African or African-Asian solidarity will never prevent us, where necessary, from denouncing our brothers if justice, fairness and truth so require.

175. We therefore maintain that the notorious Bunker Agreement constitutes the beginning of the cession of New Guinea to Indonesia. We reaffirm that what was needed was a referendum of self-determination at the end of the interim period of United Nations administration, for to leave Indonesia to organize a referendum for or against itself, when it wields all the administrative power, is tantamount to exposing it to the well-known temptation. Be that as it may, we shall fix a date here and now. We shall subject the conditions of the 1969 referendum to be organized by Indonesia to a detailed analysis and appraisal. What we are hoping is that on that day the New Guineans will be free to state their wishes and that their wishes will be recorded as they are without any hitches and without the manoeuvres, to which we have grown accustomed elsewhere. If they choose reunification with Indonesia,

we shall rejoice as we are not biased against anyone, Indonesia least of all.

176. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Cyprus who has asked to exercise the right of reply.

177. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I wish to exercise the right of reply, on behalf of the Committee of seven members on Portuguese Territories, with regard to certain charges made by the Foreign Minister of Portugal. Two points were made with regard to the Committee. One was that a newspaper in Dar es Salaam stated that the Committee would be there for a certain time and that it would hear evidence from anybody who wanted to present himself before the Committee. I wish to say in reply that according to the Foreign Minister this appeared in a newspaper in Dar es Salaam and had no reference to the Committee. It did not emanate in fact from the Committee, nor was it published with the Committee's knowledge or authority. The reference made there was to the Prime Minister's office. Speaking on behalf of the Committee, I say decidedly that this was not a publication emanating from the Committee. The Committee did write a letter to the various Governments asking for persons who could appear as petitioners, either from political organizations or other persons from the territories, who could provide up-to-date and authoritative information. This is the actual text of the responsible letter issued by the Committee in respect of petitions. Therefore, I believe that this disposes of the first point.

178. The other point was that the Committee in an irresponsible way, was making statements which referred to the ILO report, and suggesting that that report conveyed the impression that there was forced labour in the territories after 23 November 1960, that is, after the date the Labour Convention was signed by Portugal. The Foreign Minister of Portugal said that the Committee's report, in suggesting that there was such an indication in the report of the ILO Commission, was distorting the truth and making irresponsible statements.

179. The very paragraph in our report [A/5160] which was referred to by the Foreign Minister of Portugal is paragraph 367. That paragraph, among other things, refers to paragraphs 738 and 741 of the report of the ILO Commission. ^{12/} Paragraph 741 of the ILO report reads as follows:

"The Commission finds that the publicly owned railways and ports in Angola . . . continued after 23 November 1960 to recruit labour through administrative officers and chiefs in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957... "

180. Therefore our Committee, very responsibly, relied on this statement in the ILO Commission's report and actually referred to it in foot-notes. Now this statement is a clear indication that what our Committee stated in respect of the continuance of the Forced Labour Convention in the territories under Portuguese administration is a true fact, an accurate statement from that report.

181. I need not take the time to quote paragraph 378, which is also to the same effect. I would point out, however, that paragraph 728 of the report of the ILO Commission states that there were changes in the

administrative machinery for the enforcement of labour legislation with a view to abolishing the previous conditions of forced labour. That is admitted. Machinery was provided, but in fact it was not put into practice. Then paragraph 729 of the report states:

"The Commission recognizes the significance of the above-mentioned provisions taken with a view to bringing legislation into conformity with the situation arising out of the ratification of the Convention. It finds that there nevertheless continue to be certain legislative anomalies which would, if they continued to be reflected in current practice"—that is, as they were reflected—"be inconsistent with the obligations of the Convention."

182. Therefore, even with all the desire of the ILO Commission to be gentle in treating this subject, the sense of it is that forced labour continued in the Portuguese territories, and we were fully justified in bringing out what we did in our report, which I submit is a responsible report.

183. Speaking as Chairman of the Committee, I am happy, however, to note the fact that the Foreign Minister of Portugal brought out the spirit of willingness to conform with the ILO Convention. We hope that this will be put into practice.

184. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Tanganyika who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

185. Mr. SWAI (Tanganyika): I thank the President for having given me the opportunity to exercise the right of reply.

186. The Foreign Minister of Portugal, in the course of his speech, quoted an article from the Sunday News of 6 May 1962. The article in question publicized the presence and work of the Committee of seven members in Dar es Salaam.

187. The Chairman of the Committee has already given his observations on some statements made by the Foreign Minister on the work of the Committee of seven members.

188. The Foreign Minister of Portugal tried to give the impression that, and I quote from his speech: "... the whole business, the whole show was organized, arranged, and directed, by the office of the highest authority of a foreign Government" [para. 35 above]. It is crystal clear from the context of his speech that that foreign Government is the Government of Tanganyika. Indeed, Mr. Rutabanzibwa, who was mentioned in the article, is attached to my very office, in the Prime Minister's office.

189. The Foreign Minister of Portugal implies that the issue of the information by my office about the presence and work of the Committee of seven members is, and I quote from his speech, "against the Charter, against the rules of procedure, against the practice of the Assembly" [para. 34 above].

190. Nothing could be further from the truth. General Assembly resolution 1699 (XVI), which deals with the non-compliance of the Government of Portugal with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and with General Assembly resolution 1542 (XV), bears me out. Operative paragraph 7 of resolution 1699 (XVI) reads: "Requests Member States to use their influence to secure the compliance of Portugal with its obligations under the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly."

^{12/} See footnote 7.

191. We responded to the request made by the Committee of seven members, as pointed out by the representative of Cyprus, who was the Chairman. In other words, we are co-operating with the express wishes of the General Assembly of which, of course, Tanganyika is an integral part. Operative paragraph makes the position clearer. I quote:

"Further requests Member States to deny Portugal any support and assistance which it may use for the suppression of the peoples of its Non-Self-Governing Territories."

The least that we could do to comply with that paragraph was to try to stop Portugal from preventing people in its territories from voicing their grievances and demanding their rights.

192. I will not take up any more of the Assembly's time, but it is clear that it is not my Government which is against the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of procedure and the practice of the Assembly. Indeed, it is, as is well known, the Government of Portugal which is against the conscience of the world as expressed by the Assembly.

193. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Senegal who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

194. Mr. Fallou KANE (Senegal) (translated from French): I apologize for speaking at such a late hour and assure you that I shall be brief.

195. The Indonesian representative, speaking at the end of the general debate in exercise of her right of reply, referred to two statements by my country's Minister for Foreign Affairs in the General Assembly on 22 September 1961 [1012th meeting] and again recently, on 25 September 1962 [1130th meeting].

196. The position we have adopted on the question of Algeria, the problem of the Sahara in particular, to which the Indonesian representative has referred, is based on the principle of *uti possidetis juris* with which all representatives and particularly our Latin American friends are familiar, as it is one of the intangible principles underlying American international law. There is therefore no need for me to dwell on it. We have already defended this principle on two occasions, once in connexion with the question of Mauritania and the second time when dealing with the question of Algeria. We shall always continue to defend it from this rostrum.

197. With reference to the question of West New Guinea, however, the objection which we have raised and which is shared by all the States members of the African and Malagasy Union is that the principle of self-determination has not been respected, as the proposed referendum will not take place until 1969, whereas, in point of fact, the transfer of the territory of Indonesia will be made, for all intents and purposes, in May 1963.

198. It was precisely this concern which dictated the position we have adopted on the matter and which explains our negative vote when, at the beginning of the current session [1127th meeting], there arose the question of ratifying the agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

199. The Indonesian representative has, however, forgotten to say that the Senegalese representative stated from this very rostrum that he saw no objection to a possible association between Indonesia and West

New Guinea. It is our wish that the referendum should take place before and not after the transfer.

200. You will thus see that, in the interest of her case, the Indonesian representative has given an incomplete picture of the two statements by our Minister for Foreign Affairs.

201. This is the comment that my delegation wished to make in order to put the record straight before the end of this meeting, at which, I must point out, the general debate is to be concluded.

202. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of Indonesia who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

203. Mrs. SUPENI (Indonesia): Apparently the representative of Cameroon and the representative of Senegal are not satisfied because I did not go into the subject of self-determination. I intentionally did not go into that subject because, as the Assembly knows, Indonesia has from the very beginning regarded West Irian as part and parcel of Indonesia. If as a result of the negotiations Indonesia agreed to the idea of self-determination in principle, with the aim of arriving as quickly as possible at a peaceful solution of the West Irian question, that does not mean that this self-determination should be interpreted as being the same kind of self-determination which should be applied in other countries.

204. From the very beginning I have stated—and this has always been stated by our representatives in this body—that Indonesia has never considered West Irian as another country, but as part and parcel of Indonesia. My Government agreed to the idea of self-determination in principle for two reasons. First, it wished to see a peaceful solution of the problem. Secondly, since the Dutch occupied West Irian for about twelve years, many people in West Irian were still children at the time of the proclamation of our independence. Many of them probably never heard about the proclamation of independence. They learned a different history from their so-called motherland, the Netherlands. We do not deny that once these people have gone through another type of education they may want to show the world what they really desire. The fact that my Government does not deny this, however, should not be interpreted as meaning that we do not regard the people of West Irian as Indonesians. We regard them as Indonesians who have lived in a part of Indonesia but who have for a long time been educated in another way by a foreign country. We can think of our brothers and sisters in West Irian question, that does not mean that this our own children who, for compelling reasons, have been separated from their parents or have never even known that they had parents. In such a case, the parents would come to the child with the same love and understanding; they would not be angry if at first the child did not recognize them.

205. That is why the Central Government—and I want to emphasize those words—of Indonesia was able to agree to the procedure of giving the people in West Irian the freedom of choice in 1969. Naturally, this procedure cannot be carried out before 1969. If that were to happen, that would go against the very nature of the agreement. As I have said, the agreement does not mean that we concur in any interpretation to the effect that West Irian is not part of our country. The provision that the freedom of choice—I shall not use the term "self-determination"—is to be exercised only after five years have passed means that the principle that West Irian is part of Indonesia is recognized. For

s that is the main principle. After five years, there will be a process in which the people of West Irian will choose whether or not they wish to join Indonesia. We would not deny the result of that process. But we are sure that as soon as the people of West Irian become acquainted with the rest of Indonesia, as soon as they begin to remember their parents, these children will not challenge their fathers and mothers.

Organization of work

06. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Assembly of the projected order of business for the next few days.

07. Unless something should arise which urgently necessitates a different course, it is our intention to hold plenary meetings tomorrow morning and afternoon and Monday morning. The Chairman of the First Committee is very anxious to press forward with the debate that is now taking place in that Committee. He thinks that it would facilitate matters for the First Committee if there were not simultaneous meetings of the Assembly and of the First Committee at the times I have just mentioned.

208. On Monday afternoon it is proposed that there should be a plenary meeting to consider item 92 entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations". I would request delegations to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible if they intend to take part in the debate on this item. I wish so far as possible to avoid a contingency which often arises—that is, that a debate begins on an item and, for want of speakers, the full time of the meeting, whether it be the first meeting on the item or subsequent meetings, cannot be utilized. If delegations will kindly comply with my request, that contingency will to a very large degree be avoided. An additional precaution that I intend to take is the following: along with item 92 and, later, other principal items, smaller items will also be inscribed on the agenda. Thus, if the contingency that I have mentioned should arise, the Assembly can proceed to the consideration of the next item. As far as possible we shall try to ensure that these other items are either formal items or items not requiring prolonged consideration.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.